



02-27-04

Image AF  
2823

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**In re Application of:**

Whitman et al.

**Serial No.:** 09/542,783

**Filed:** April 4, 2000

**For:** SPIN COATING FOR MAXIMUM  
FILL CHARACTERISTIC YIELDING A  
PLANARIZED THIN FILM SURFACE

**Confirmation No.:** 6870

**Examiner:** B. Kebede

**Group Art Unit:** 2823

**Attorney Docket No.:** 2269-4294US

NOTICE OF EXPRESS MAILING

Express Mail Mailing Label Number: EV325773327US

Date of Deposit with USPS: February 25, 2004

Person making Deposit: Christopher Haughton

**RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF DEFECTIVE APPEAL BRIEF/  
TRANSMITTAL FOR CORRECTED APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences


Sirs:

The Notice of Defective Appeal Brief mailed on February 20, 2004, has been received and reviewed. In the Notice, it is incorrectly asserted that claims 18-87, which are listed in the Appendix to the Appeal Brief filed on December 2, 2003, were canceled from the above-referenced application. While claims 18-87 have been withdrawn from consideration, none of these claims has been canceled, nor has or does the undersigned attorney authorize their cancellation by way of an Examiner's Amendment.

In any event, as none of claims 18-87 is subject to any of the rejections that have been appealed in the above-referenced application, a corrected version of the Appeal Brief, the Appendix to which identifies each of claims 18-87 as having been withdrawn from consideration, is being transmitted herewith.

It is respectfully submitted that the accompanying Appeal Brief complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brick G. Power", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brick G. Power  
Registration No. 38,581  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT, PC  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: February 25, 2004

BGP/dp

Document in ProLaw

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In re Application of:**

Whitman et al.

**Serial No.:** 09/542,783

**Filed:** April 4, 2000

**For:** SPIN COATING FOR MAXIMUM  
FILL CHARACTERISTIC YIELDING A  
PLANARIZED THIN FILM SURFACE

**Confirmation No.:** 6870

**Examiner:** B. Kebede

**Group Art Unit:** 2823

**Attorney Docket No.:** 2269-4294US



**NOTICE OF EXPRESS MAILING**

Express Mail Mailing Label Number: EV325772984US

Date of Deposit with USPS: December 2, 2003

Person making Deposit: Christopher Haughton

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Sirs:

This brief is submitted in TRIPLICATE pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(a) and in the format required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c) and with the fee required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c).

(1) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

U.S. Serial No. 09/542,783, the application at issue in the above-referenced appeal, has been assigned to Micron Technology, Inc.. The assignment has been recorded with the United States Patent & Trademark Office (hereinafter the "Office") at Reel No. 10729, Frame No. 0057. Accordingly, Micron Technology, Inc. is the real party in interest to the referenced appeal.

(2) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

The undersigned attorney is not aware of any action, including any appeals or interferences, that is currently ongoing before Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in any application which is related to the above-referenced application and that may affect or be affected by the Board's decision in the appeal of the status of the above-referenced application.

(3) STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-87 remain pending in the above-referenced application. Of these, only claims 1-17 have been considered. Each of claims 1-17 stands rejected.

Claims 88-101, which were drawn to nonelected inventions, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

No claims have been allowed.

The rejections of claims 1-17 are being appealed.

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The above-referenced application was originally filed with 101 claims.

A Preliminary Amendment was mailed on January 31, 2001.

On July 12, 2001, a restriction requirement and an election of species requirement were made. In a response dated July 26, 2001, an election, responsive to the restriction requirement, was made to prosecute claims 1-87 without traverse. In response to the election of species requirement, an election was made to prosecute claims drawn to a method for disposing material on a semiconductor device structure. It was also explained that claim 1, which is generic to the elected specie, is also generic to others of the identified species of invention.

Another restriction and election of species requirement was made on December 10, 2001. A response was mailed on October 16, 2001. In response to the restriction requirement, an election was again made, without traverse, to prosecute claims 1-87. In addition, in response to the election of species requirement, an election was again made to prosecute claims drawn to a method for disposing material on a semiconductor device structure. An explanation was also provided that claim 1, which is generic to the elected specie, is also generic to several of the other identified species of invention.

On February 28, 2002, in a first Office Action on the merits, only claims 1-17 were considered. Each of these claims was rejected.

An Amendment responsive to the February 28, 2002, Office Action was filed on May 28, 2002. Revisions to several of the considered claims were presented in the Amendment. In addition, claims 88-101 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

A second, Final Office Action was mailed on August 14, 2002. Again, each of claims 1-17 was rejected.

An Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 was mailed on October 7, 2002, and received a filing date of October 15, 2002.

The Office refused to enter the amendments that were presented in the October 15, 2002, amendment, as evidenced by an Advisory Action dated November 19, 2002.

Accordingly, on November 22, 2002, a Request for Continued Examination was filed requesting entry of the amendment previously refused.

Thereafter, on December 19, 2002, a third Office Action on the merits was mailed. Despite the amendments that were presented in the October 15, 2002, Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and the accompanying explanations as to why the pending claims were patentable, each of claims 1-17 was again rejected.

Further remarks were presented in a Response dated March 24, 2003.

The Office responded with a fourth, Final Office Action, which was mailed on June 3, 2003, in which each of claims 1-17 was again rejected.

A final attempt to convince the Office of the patentability of claims 1-17 was made in a Response to Final Office Action, mailed on July 29, 2003.

Nonetheless, the Examiner elected to maintain all of the then-pending rejections in an Advisory Action mailed on September 29, 2003.

Upon receiving the Advisory Action, a Notice of Appeal was filed on October 2, 2003.

This Appeal Brief follows the Notice of Appeal.

(5) SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The claims that have been considered in the above-referenced application are drawn to methods for forming nonplanarized layers on semiconductor device structures. The nonplanarized layers include regions (*e.g.*, portions located over or within at least one recess) with substantially planar surfaces, on semiconductor device structures.

A material is applied to a semiconductor device structure by a known process and is spread across the surface of the semiconductor device structure so as to substantially fill at least one recess of the semiconductor device structure. The material is applied in such a way that a layer formed therewith is thinner, or nonexistent, over regions of the semiconductor device structure. By way of example, the thickness of a portion of the layer that overlies or is located within a nonrecessed area of the semiconductor device structure may be about half or less than half of the depth of the recess. The material may be spread across the surface of the semiconductor device structure by use of spin-on techniques. In spinning the material onto the semiconductor device structure, the material may be applied at a first speed, the rate of spinning decreased to a second speed at which the material is permitted to at least partially set up, then the rate of spinning gradually increased, or ramped up, to a third speed at which a desired, reduced thickness of material covering the surface may be obtained. The rate at which the semiconductor device capacitor structure is spun may again be decreased to permit the mask material to further set. An edge bead of material may then be removed from the semiconductor device structure and the semiconductor device structure spun once again to remove solvents, if any, from the material.

The methods may be used, by way of example only, to form masks for hemispherical grain (HSG) polysilicon bottom electrodes of capacitor structures, dopant masks for shallow

trench isolation structures, stress buffers for subsequent use in planarization processes, and the like.

(6) ISSUES

(A) Whether claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, and 17 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for reciting subject matter which is not anticipated by that taught in U.S. Patent 6,278,153 to Kikuchi et al. (hereinafter “Kikuchi”);

(B) Whether, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claims 3-7 are nonobvious and, thus, patentable over the asserted combination of teachings from Kikuchi and U.S. Patent 6,117,486 to Yoshihara (hereinafter “Yoshihara”);

(C) Whether claim 10 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for reciting subject matter which is patentable over that taught in Kikuchi, in view of teachings from U.S. Patent 6,046,083 to Lin et al. (hereinafter “Lin”); and

(D) Whether each of claims 12-15 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for reciting subject matter which is patentable over that taught in Kikuchi, in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent 6,326,282 to Park et al. (hereinafter “Park”).

(7) GROUPING OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-17 should be grouped together. Claim 1 is the most generic of these claims. Claims 2-17 stand with claim 1, but claims 2 and 5 do not fall with claim 1.



(8) ARGUMENT

(A) Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

(i) Applicable Law

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single reference which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

(ii) Reference Relied Upon

A summary of the pertinent teachings of Kikuchi, which has been relied upon in the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, and 17, follows:

*Kikuchi*

Kikuchi shows, in Fig. 6D, an intermediate semiconductor device structure in which a layer of resist 20 that has been disposed within and over a via-hole 23a. Kikuchi also discloses that the resist 20 can be applied by several conventional methods, including spin-coating.

Col. 17, lines 63-66.

While resist 20 *appears* in Fig. 6D of Kikuchi to have a planar surface, Kikuchi lacks any express or inherent description that the surface of resist 20 is planar.

(iii) Discussion

Independent claim 1 recites a method for disposing a material on a semiconductor device structure. In the method of independent claim 1, material is disposed on a surface of a semiconductor device structure “so as to substantially fill . . . at least one recess [thereof, the] material covering [the] surface having a thickness less than a depth of said at least one recess . . .” A material layer with these characteristics is formed “without subsequently removing said material from [the] surface . . .” Independent claim 1 also requires that “an upper surface of at least a portion of said material over or within said at least one recess [be] substantially planar.”

It is respectfully submitted that Kikuchi does not anticipate a method that includes disposing material in such a way that “an upper surface of at least a portion of [the] material over or within . . . at least one recess [is] substantially planar.”

While it has been asserted that Fig. 6D of Kikuchi shows a layer of resist 20 which *appears* to have a planar surface, it is respectfully submitted that Kikuchi, in fact, lacks any express description that the surface of resist 20 is planar. A high standard has been set for reliance on drawings in prior art rejections. M.P.E.P. § 2125 provides that “[d]rawings and pictures can anticipate claims if they clearly show the structure which is claimed,” but cautions that the “drawings must be evaluated for what they reasonably disclose and suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art.” M.P.E.P. § 2125 indicates, as an example, that the relative dimensions of features of an object illustrated in drawings would not be reasonably disclosed or suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art unless the reference also discloses that the drawings are to scale. In view of the guidance that has been provided in M.P.E.P. § 2125, without further guidance

from the specification of Kikuchi, the mere inclusion of a straight line to depict the surface of resist 20 does not adequately indicate that surfaces represented by the straight lines are substantially planar. Thus, Kikuchi does not expressly or inherently describe that the surfaces of resist 20 is substantially planar.

Moreover, it has been asserted, at pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action dated December 19, 2002, that because independent claim 1 does not specify a particular type of semiconductor device (*i.e.*, the type of semiconductor device described in Kikuchi), reasoning that spin-coating and surface tension would cause the resist 20 of Kikuchi to be nonplanar does not necessarily apply to Kikuchi. It has been further asserted that because of this purported ambiguity (*i.e.*, that the reasoning that has been submitted *may not* apply), Kikuchi expressly describes that the resist 20 within via-holes 23a is planar. This assertion is flawed. The type of semiconductor device is irrelevant, as processes that are employed and properties of the material that is used in Kikuchi have a much more significant bearing on the planarity or nonplanarity of the resist 20 than does the fact that the device is a DRAM device, SRAM device, PROM, EEPROM, processing device, etc. As Kikuchi describes the use of a spin-coating process to introduce resist 20 into via-holes 23a, it is clear that the result of both the spin-coating process and the surface tension of the resist would be nonplanarity of the surface of resist 20 within the via-holes 23a.

It is also respectfully submitted that Kikuchi lacks any inherent description that the method described therein results in a layer of resist 20 with a planar surface. In this regard, M.P.E.P. § 2112 provides:

The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993) . . . ‘To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence ‘must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill . . .’ *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

As would be readily apparent to those of ordinary skill in the art, it is clear that the conventional spin-on processes and photoresist material employed in Kikuchi do not necessarily result in a planar surface on resist 20 which is disposed within via-holes 23a. As pointed out by the “Background” section of the specification of the above-referenced application, at page 3, line 15, to page 4, line 29, the limitations in previously known spin-on methods, as well as material properties (*e.g.*, viscosity, solids content, surface tension, adherence to adjacent materials, etc.), may prevent a layer of material, such as the resist 20 disclosed by Kikuchi and illustrated in Fig. 6D, from having a substantially planar upper surface. *See, e.g.*, Van Zandt, P., *Microchip Fabrication – Chapter 8, Photolithography—Preparation to Exposure*, pages 176-178 and 185-187 (hereinafter “Van Zandt”). Further, Van Zandt, at page 185, evidently recognizing that a spun-on layer of photoresist will include valleys that are located over recesses in a semiconductor substrate, describes spun-on photoresist in terms of *layer* thickness (*e.g.*, 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$  to 1.5  $\mu\text{m}$  thick, with variations of  $\pm 0.01 \mu\text{m}$ ) rather than in terms of surface planarity. U.S. Patent 6,117,486 to Yoshihara (hereinafter “Yoshihara”) provides further evidence that the surfaces of spun-on photoresist layers may not be planar. Yoshihara, col. 1, line 18, to col. 2, line 17).

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Kikuchi does not expressly or inherently describe that resist 20 is disposed on a surface of a semiconductor device structure 21 such that the resist 20 over or within a via-hole 23a thereof has an upper surface which is substantially planar.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the foregoing arguments are commensurate with the scope of the claims since they focus on the recitation in independent claim 1 that the act of “disposing” includes forming a material layer with “an upper surface . . . over or within . . . at least one recess” of a semiconductor device structure, with the upper surface “being substantially planar.”

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Kikuchi does not anticipate each and every element of independent claim 1, as is required to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Thus, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), independent claim 1 is allowable over Kikuchi.

Claims 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, and 17 are each allowable, among other reasons, as depending either directly or indirectly from claim 1, which is allowable.

Claim 2, which is rejected as being anticipated by Figs 6A-6E; 10A-10E; 13A-13E, is further allowable since none of these figures shows disposing a material “so as to substantially fill . . . at least one recess *without substantially covering* [a] surface of a semiconductor device structure . . .” While the various figures that have been referenced in support of this assertion, including Figs. 6E, 10D, 10E, and 13E of Kikuchi, show structures which include recesses that are substantially filled with material while the same material does not cover the surfaces of the illustrated semiconductor devices, these structures are not formed by processes that meet the requirements of independent claim 1. In particular, in the method described in Kikuchi,

conventional resist application techniques are used to apply resist to the surface of a semiconductor device, then the excess resist is removed by *another, subsequent process*. For example, etchants may be used in the conventional processes described in Kikuchi to remove excess material (col. 18, lines 3-5; col. 26, lines 19-21), or a positive photoresist may be applied, then exposed to electromagnetic radiation, from which portions of the photoresist within recesses are shielded (col. 18, lines 5-8; col. 35, lines 40-52), with exposed and developed portions of the photoresist being subsequently washed away. Thus, Kikuchi neither expressly nor inherently describes “disposing” a material on a surface of a semiconductor device structure and within recesses thereof so as to substantially fill the recesses “without substantially covering [the] surface.”

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, and 17 be reversed.

(B) Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-7, 10, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

(i) Applicable Law

The standard for a claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is set forth in M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j), which provides:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally

available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

(ii) References Relied Upon

A summary of the pertinent teachings of Yoshihara, which has been relied upon in the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 3-7, follows:

*Yoshihara*

Yoshihara teaches that by spinning a semiconductor wafer at high speeds ("as low as 2000 rpm"; col. 11, line 16), lowering the speed for a time, and re-increasing it to high speeds, the wafer can be coated with material in such a way that the material layer has a substantially uniform thickness.

(iii) Discussion

(a) Kikuchi in View of Yoshihara

Claims 3-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi in view of Yoshihara.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 3-7 are allowable, among other reasons, as depending either directly or indirectly from claim 1, which is itself allowable.

Moreover, neither Kikuchi, Yoshihara, nor knowledge available to one ordinarily skilled in the art would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to combine teachings from Kikuchi with teachings from Yoshihara to arrive at the inventions to which claims 3-7 are drawn. Kikuchi teaches that layers of resist may be spin-coated onto semiconductor substrates that include recesses. As is well known in the art, conventional spin-coating processes result in resist layers which have substantially uniform thicknesses; a teaching which is not contradicted by Kikuchi. However, Kikuchi neither teaches nor suggests that resist layers so formed have substantially planar surfaces, at least over or within the recesses of such semiconductor substrates. Yoshihara teaches that by spinning a semiconductor wafer at high speeds (“as low as 2000 rpm”; col. 11, line 16), lowering the speed for a time, and re-increasing it to high speeds, the wafer can be coated with material in such a way that the material layer has a substantially *uniform thickness*. It is clearly not possible for a layer which has a substantially uniform thickness and which is formed over a nonplanar surface to have a planar surface. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that Yoshihara does not supply the motivation, suggestion, or teaching missing from Kikuchi that the techniques described in Kikuchi or Yoshihara are useful for disposing material within recesses such that the upper surface of at least the material within or over the recesses has a substantially planar upper surface.

As neither of these references teaches or suggests that resist or any other material within recesses of a semiconductor device structure may have a planar surface, as required by independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the only way one of ordinary skill in the art could have been motivated to combine the teachings of these references in such a way as to render obvious a method which includes disposing material within a recess so that the material



has a substantially planar surface would have been to improperly glean such motivation from the description of the above-referenced application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Kikuchi and Yoshihara in the manner that has been asserted.

It is also respectfully submitted that the asserted combination of teachings from Kikuchi and Yoshihara does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 5. In particular, neither Kikuchi nor Yoshihara teaches or suggests initially spinning a semiconductor device structure at a rate of about 1,000 rpm, as recited in claim 5. Instead, the initial spin rate taught by Yoshihara is “as low as 2000 rpm . . .,” which is more than twice as high as the initial rate recited in claim 5. Col. 11, line 16.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established against any of claims 3-7. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), each of claims 3-7 is allowable over the combination of Kikuchi with Yoshihara.

(b) Kikuchi in View of Lin

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi in view of U.S. Patent 6,046,083 to Lin et al. (hereinafter “Lin”).

It is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable, among other reasons, as depending from claim 1, which is allowable.

(c) Kikuchi in View of Park

Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi in view of U.S. Patent 6,326,282 to Park et al. (hereinafter "Park").

It is respectfully submitted that claims 12-15 are allowable, among other reasons, as depending either directly or indirectly from claim 1, which is allowable.

For these reasons, reversal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 3-7, 10, and 12-15 is respectfully requested.

(9) ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENTS

It is respectfully submitted that, as independent claim 1 remains generic to all of the species of invention that have been identified by the Office, claims 18-87 should be brought back into consideration in the above-referenced application and allowed for the reasons that have been provided herein.

(10) APPENDIX

A copy of claims 1-87 as presently amended is appended hereto as the "Appendix."

(11) CONCLUSION

(A) Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, and 17 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for reciting subject matter which is not anticipated by that the subject matter taught in Kikuchi;


(B) Claims 3-7 are nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and, thus, allowable over the asserted combination of teachings from Kikuchi and Yoshihara;

(C) Claim 10 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for reciting subject matter which is patentable over that taught in Kikuchi, in view of teachings from Lin; and

(D) Each of claims 12-15 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for reciting subject matter which is allowable over that taught in Kikuchi, in view of the teachings of Park.

Accordingly, reversal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 16, and 17 and of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 3-7, 10, and 12-15 is respectfully requested, as is the allowance of claims 1-87.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brick G. Power", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brick G. Power  
Registration No. 38,581  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT, PC  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: February 25, 2004

BGP/djp  
Document in ProLaw

## APPENDIX

### CLAIMS

1. A method for disposing a material on a semiconductor device structure, comprising:  
providing a semiconductor device structure including a surface and at least one recess formed in said surface;  
disposing said material on said surface so as to substantially fill said at least one recess, said material covering said surface having a thickness less than a depth of said at least one recess without subsequently removing said material from said surface, an upper surface of at least a portion of said material over or within said at least one recess being substantially planar.
2. The method of claim 1, wherein said disposing comprises disposing said material so as to substantially fill said at least one recess without substantially covering said surface.
3. The method of claim 1, wherein said disposing comprises:  
applying said material to said surface of said semiconductor device structure;  
spinning said semiconductor device structure;  
decreasing a rate of said spinning while permitting said material to at least partially cure; and  
gradually increasing said rate of said spinning.
4. The method of claim 3, further comprising exposing said material to a soft baking temperature following said gradually increasing.

5. The method of claim 3, wherein said spinning is effected at a rate of about 1,000 rpm.

6. The method of claim 3, wherein said decreasing said rate comprises decreasing said rate of said spinning to about 100 rpm.

7. The method of claim 3, wherein said gradually increasing said rate comprises gradually increasing said rate of said spinning to at least about 1,000 rpm.

8. The method of claim 1, wherein, upon exposing said material disposed over an entirety of said semiconductor device structure to an etchant, said material covering said surface is substantially removed therefrom, while said material located in said at least one recess substantially fills said at least one recess.

9. The method of claim 1, wherein said providing said semiconductor device structure comprises providing a stacked capacitor structure with said at least one recess comprising at least one container formed in an insulator layer of said stacked capacitor structure, said surface and said at least one container being lined with a conductive material.

10. The method of claim 9, wherein said providing said semiconductor device structure comprises providing said stacked capacitor structure with said surface and said at least one container being lined with doped hemispherical grain polysilicon.

11. The method of claim 9, wherein said disposing said material comprises disposing a mask material over said semiconductor device structure.

12. The method of claim 1, wherein said providing said semiconductor device structure comprises providing a shallow trench isolation structure with said at least one recess comprising at least one trench formed in a surface of said shallow trench isolation structure.

13. The method of claim 12, wherein said disposing said material comprises disposing a mask material over said shallow trench isolation structure.

14. The method of claim 12, wherein said providing said shallow trench isolation structure comprises providing said shallow trench isolation structure with an insulator layer substantially filling said at least one trench and covering said surface.

15. The method of claim 14, wherein said disposing said material comprises disposing a stress buffer over said insulator layer, said stress buffer having a substantially planar surface without removing material thereof following said disposing.

16. The method of claim 1, wherein said providing comprises providing a semiconductor device structure having a surface with at least one dual damascene trench recessed therein and a layer of conductive material with a nonplanar surface disposed in said at least one dual damascene trench and at least partially covering said surface.

17. The method of claim 16, wherein said disposing said material comprises disposing a stress buffer over said layer of conductive material, said stress buffer having a substantially planar surface without removing material thereof following said disposing.

18-87. (Withdrawn)